APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/453,918	04/27/2000	Hwa Kyung Lee	Q58987	1307

7590   02/11/2004

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER
LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Offic Action Summary	09/453,918	LEE ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Kenny Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 November 2003</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-14</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-14</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 November 2003</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 2-14 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2.   The drawings were received on 11/26/2003. These drawings are objected because they

are too small and unclear for printing. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to

the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 4, 8, 10-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Kotola et al (hereinafter Kotola), US Patent 6,321,257, in view of Kraft et al (hereinafter Kraft),

US Patent 6,487,424.

5.   Kotoal and Kraft were cited in the last office action.

6.   As per claim 4, Kotola taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4 including

a method for executing an object in a wireless internet access terminal, comprising the steps of:

      a. Interpreting data inputted through the internet and displaying the inputted data on

          a screen (col.2, lines 32-37, col.3, lines 17-32, 59-65) of the wireless internet

          access terminal, said data including plural objects that are each linked to

          predetermined resource access location information (col.3, lines 24-32, col.7,

          lines 4-14).

7.   Kotola did not specifically teach to focus any one of the objects displayed on the screen

and to display plural execution items sequentially one by one by displaying one of the plural

execution items of the focused object on one screen and executing an execution item displayed

on the present screen by inputs from a button. Kraft taught a data entry method to focusing

(highlight) any one of plural objects (fig. 6, col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36) and to display plural

execution items sequentially one by one by displaying one of the plural execution items of the

focused object on one screen (abstract, col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36, 52-59) and executing an

execution item displayed on the present screen by inputs from a button (fig. 6, col.1, lines 52-59,

col.2, lines 28-41, col.3, lines 35-40, col.12, lines 63-65). One would have been motivated to

adapt Kraft's teaching of displaying plural execution items to implement said calculator

functions in their mobile phone systems using such displaying and item focus method (col.12,

lines 28-67). One would have also been motivated to use Kraft's displaying method since it

supports complex signs displaying that includes said Chinese characters or so on (col.3, lines 11-

12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to combine the teachings of Kotola and Kraft because Kraft's teaching of displaying plural

execution items sequentially one by one provides an organized screen display and allows user to

easily view and pick the desire objects which includes complex signs or characters (col.1, lines

20-27, 30-36).

8.   As per claim 8, Kotola and Kraft taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4.

Kotola further taught to include that wherein the execution items of an object include operations

of updating a screen while navigating according to the resource access location information

(col.7, lines 4-10); updating a screen for displaying the resource access location information

(col.7, lines 10-18); and storing the resource access location information in a temporary storage

unit to be immediately accessed in the necessity of a user (col.7, lines 19-28).

9.   As per claim 10, Kotola and Kraft taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim

4. Kraft further taught to sequentially display the execution item one by one on the screen (fig.

6, col.1, lines 52-59, col.2, lines 28-41, col.3, lines 35-40, col.12, lines 63-65) and that execution

items are stored in a storage unit, and one execution item is read from the storage unit by an

input from the button to be displayed on one screen, so that plural execution items are

sequentially displayed on the screen one by one (fig.5, col.1, lines 20-27, 52-59). Kotola and

Kraft did not specifically teach that the execution items including "get", "information view",

"bookmark", and "cancel" are sequentially stored in a storage unit. However, storing execution

items in sequence in a storage unit sequentially is well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have noticed that such storage method could be programmed using a circular link

list structure. Furthermore, it is a design choice for the maker of the invention to provide different execution items as needed to execute the desired commands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola, Kraft and sequentially storing the execution items and displaying by an input.

10.   As per claim 11, Kotola and Kraft taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10. Kotola further taught to use a database as a storage unit (col.7, lines 23-28). Kotola and Kraft did not specifically teach that storage unit is a flash memory. However, it is well known in the art that use a flash memory as either the memory for a device or a hard drive. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola and Kraft and use a flash memory as a storage unit similar to how many digital cameras function for the Kotola and Kraft's apparatus as design choice.

11.   As per claim 14, Kotola and Kraft taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4. Kotola further taught that each object is defined by at least one HTML tag (col.7, lines 28-51).

12.   Claims 2-3, 9 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al (hereinafter Kotola), US Patent 6,321,257, in view of Kraft et al (hereinafter Kraft), US Patent 6,487,424, and Tuoriniemi et al (hereinafter Tuoriniemi), US 6,470,197.

13.   Tuoriniemi was cited in the previous office action.

14.   As per claim 2, Kotola taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method

for executing an object in a wireless internet access terminal, comprising steps of:

  b.   interpreting data inputted through the internet and display the inputted data (col.2,

       lines 32-37, col.3, lines 17-32, 59-65) on a screen of the wireless internet access

       terminal, said data including plural objects that are each linked to predetermined

       resource location information (col.3, lines 24-32, col.7, lines 4-14).

15.   Kotola did not specifically teach to focus any one of the objects displayed on the screen

and to select and execute any one of various execution items of the focused object according to

an input state of a single button. Kraft taught a data entry method to focusing (highlight) any one

of plural objects (fig. 6, col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36) and to display plural execution items

sequentially one by one by displaying one of the plural execution items of the focused object on

one screen (abstract, col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36, 52-59) and executing an execution item displayed

on the present screen by inputs from a button (fig. 6, col.1, lines 52-59, col.2, lines 28-41, col.3,

lines 35-40, col.12, lines 63-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola and Kraft because Kraft's

teaching of displaying and highlighting the objects, selecting and executing the highlighted

object according the input state of a single button eliminates the needs of using or having

multiple buttons for selection on the mobile device and can reduce the size of the mobile device

such as a cellular phone.

16.   Kotola and Kraft did not specifically teach that the input state of the button include a

short time period input, a long time period input, and a twice consecutive input. However, it is

well known that a button can support different input states. For example, the left button of a

computer mouse is provided with three different input state: 1) a short click highlights an object,

2) double click executes or opens an object, and 3) press and hold the button allows mouse to

select more than one objects.   Another example is the power button of a Palm pilot which is

given two different input state: 1) short time period input turns on the device and 2) long time

period input turns on the back light to night viewing. Any computer or palm pilot user would

have easily acknowledged that a button can be implemented to support multiple input states.

Furthermore, Tuoriniemi taught to use a single button with different input states to send

commands to a headset control system used with a cellular phone (col.3, lines 47-48, col.4, lines

46-59, col.5, lines 20-29, col.6, lines 50-57, fig.6). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola,

Kraft and Tuoriniemi because Tuoriniemi's teaching of providing three or more different input

state to a single button reduce the number of unnecessary buttons on Kotola and Kraft's

apparatus.

17.   As per claim 3, Kotola, Kraft and Tuoriniemi taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 2. Kotola further taught to include that wherein the execution items of an

object include operations of updating a screen while navigating according to the resource access

location information (col.7, lines 4-10); updating a screen for displaying the resource access

location information (col.7, lines 10-18); and storing the resource access location information in

a temporary storage unit to be immediately accessed in the necessity of a user (col.7, lines 19-

28).

18.   As per claim 12, Kotola, Kraft and Tuoriniemi taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 2. Kotola further taught that each object is defined by at least one HTML tag

(col.7, lines 28-51).

19.   As per claim 13, Kotola, Kraft and Tuoriniemi taught the invention substantially as

claimed in claim 12. Kotola further taught that wherein the resource access location information

linked to a corresponding object is an attribute of the least one HTML tag defining the

corresponding object (col.7, lines 28-51, 60-67, col.8, lines 1-21, 45-59).

20.   As per claim 9, Kotola and Kraft taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4.

Kotola further taught that a screen is updated while navigating according to the resource access

location information (col.7, lines 4-10). Kotola and Kraft did not teach that the screen is updated

if the input from the button lasts for less than a certain time period. However, it is design choice

for one of ordinary skill in the art to select any type of inputs and sign it to use for displaying the

plural execution items of the focuses object or execute the displayed item. Microsoft Windows

allows users to change the button assignments to suit user preferences. Furthermore, Tuoriniemi

taught to use a single button with different input states to send commands to a headset control

system used with a cellular phone (col.3, lines 47-48, col.4, lines 46-59, col.5, lines 20-29, col.6,

lines 50-57, fig.6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola, Kraft and Tuoriniemi because

Tuoriniemi's teaching of providing three or more different input state to a single button reduce

the number of unnecessary buttons on Kotola and Kraft's apparatus.

21.   Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotola et al

(hereinafter Kotola), US Patent 6,321,257, and Kraft et al (hereinafter Kraft), US Patent

6,487,424, as applied to claims 1-4 and 8-11 above, and further in view of Mitchell et al

(hereinafter Mitchell), US Patent 5,966,671.

22.   Mitchell was cited in the last office action.

23.   As per claim 5, Kotola and Kraft taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 4.

Kotola and Kraft did not specifically teach that the inputs from the button to include an input

lasting for more than a certain time period and a stop of the input. However, it is well known in

the art to use a long pause input and a stop of the input. Such example can be found in a Palm

pilot's power button. One can press and hold the power button for a certain time period to turn

on the back light for the screen and also use the same button to turn off the light. Mitchell taught

a mobile phone system to include a smart button uses a long press and a short press as different

inputs (col.4, lines 36-38, 42-48, 55-56, 59-62) that enables one-hand operation (col.1, lines 66-

67b col.2, lines 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell because Mitchell's

teaching of using long press and short press for a button enables the buttons on Kotola and

Kraft's apparatus to control more functions using only one hand.

24.   As per claim 6, Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell taught the invention substantially as claimed

in claims 4-5. Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell did not specifically teach that the plural execution on

times are sequentially displayed if the input from the button lasts for more than a certain time

period, and an execution item displayed on the present screen is executed if the input is stopped.

However, it is design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art to select any type of inputs and

sign it to use for displaying the plural execution items of the focuses object or execute the

displayed item. Mitchell taught to use the long press to initial or end a call (col.5, lines 57-60,

col.6, lines 12-16). Microsoft Windows allows users to change the button assignments to suit

user preferences. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola, Kraft, Mitchell and further assign

different inputs to execute different commands in Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell's apparatus

according to design choices.

25.   As per claim 7, Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell taught the invention substantially as claimed

in claim 6 including displaying a first item of a menu on the screen if the input last for more than

a certain time period and executing an execution item displayed on the present screen if the

lasting input is stopped (see claims 5-6 rejection). Mitchell further taught to judge if the certain

time period elapses; judge if the input still lasts in case the certain time period elapsed; and judge

if the item displayed on the present screen is the last one in case that the input still lasts (col.6,

lines 44-51).

26.   Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell did not specifically teach the steps of:

       c.   Branching to the time period elapse judgment step after displaying a next item on

          the screen if the item is not the last one; and

       d.   Branching to the first item display step after displaying a "cancel" time if the item

          is the last one.

However, it is well known in the art to provide the same features for different windows. For

example, each different window in Windows environment is give the function of close,

minimize, maximize, size and move even when the contents displayed in the windows are

different. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide judgment step

for a next item on the screen so to determine whether the time period elapsed or not.

Furthermore, it is obvious to loop the options back to the first one when the option display

reaches the last one so the display of the options can be continuously. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teachings of Kotola, Kraft and Mitchell and circularly loop the options so to continuously display

the options.

Response to Arguments

27.   Applicant's arguments filed 11/26/03, regarding claim 1-11, have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive.

28.   In the remark, the applicant argued that (1) Kotola and Kraft do not teach the limitation of "interpreting data inputted through the internet and displaying the inputted data on a screen of the wireless internet access terminal, said data including plural objects that are each linked to predetermined resource location information". (2) No suggestion or motivation within Kotola or Kraft to combine the references. (3) Kotola nor Kraft teaches or suggests the steps of "focusing any one of the objects displayed on the screen" and "selecting and executing any one of various execution items of the focused object".

29.   Examiner respectfully traverse the argument:

As to point (1), Kotola taught the limitation of interpreting data inputted through the internet and displaying the inputted data on a screen (col.2, lines 32-37, col.3, lines 17-32, 59-65) of the wireless internet access terminal, said data including plural objects that are each linked to predetermined resource access location information (col.3, lines 24-32, col.7, lines 4-14).

As to point (2), In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kotola's teaching of a method of entering information into a terminal, displaying, navigating through a plurality of options and selecting one of the options in

combination with Kraft enables user to increase the data entry rate and also handling of complex

signs (col.1, lines 30-36, 49-59, col.3, lines 11-20).

As to point (3), Kraft taught a data entry method to focusing (highlight) any one of plural objects

(fig. 6, col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36) and to display plural execution items sequentially one by one

by displaying one of the plural execution items of the focused object on one screen (abstract,

col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36, 52-59) and executing an execution item displayed on the present screen

by inputs from a button (fig. 6, col.1, lines 52-59, col.2, lines 28-41, col.3, lines 35-40, col.12,

lines 63-65). One would have been motivated to adapt Kraft's teaching of displaying plural

execution items to implement said calculator functions in their mobile phone systems using such

displaying and item focus method (col.12, lines 28-67). One would have also been motivated to

use Kraft's displaying method since it supports complex signs displaying that includes said

Chinese characters or so on (col.3, lines 11-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kotola and Kraft

because Kraft's teaching of displaying plural execution items sequentially one by one provides

an organized screen display and allows user to easily view and pick the desire objects which

includes complex signs or characters (col.1, lines 20-27, 30-36).

Conclusion

30.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

31.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. Additionally, the fax numbers for

Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl
January 30, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100